

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 5-12. These sheets, which include Figs. 4-12, replace the original sheets including those same Figures.

Fig. 5-12 have been corrected to provide clean drawing sheets without scanning markings.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 15 are now present in this application, of which claims 1 and 15 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1 and 15 have been amended and the FIGS. 5-12 have been replaced with cleaner drawing sheets.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Request for Withdrawal of Finality of Office Action**

Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment is being filed concurrently with an RCE. Accordingly, withdrawal of the finality of the previous Office Action, and an Office Action on the merits with respect to claims 1-8 and 15 are respectfully requested.

### **Objection to the Drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the lines in Figures 5-12 are not clear, clean, and crisp.

In order to overcome this objection, Applicants are concurrently submitting Replacement Drawing Sheets for the Examiner's approval, which address each of the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview, which was conducted on July 29, 2010. An Examiner Interview Summary was made of record as Paper No. 20100729.

During the interview, Applicants' representative addressed the objections to the drawings, the rejection of claims 1-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the rejection of claims 1-8 and 15 over Duhamel, and the rejection of claims 1-8 and 15 over Spinelli.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, Applicants representative argued that the particular contents of the images were not relevant to the claimed invention. Rather the focus of the claimed invention deals with how the images are processed. In addition, Applicants representative agreed to resubmit the drawings in a cleaner form.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicants representative identified relevant portions of the application that adequately defines “normal operation” and “exceptional situations.” Namely, Applicants’ representative directed the Examiner’s attention to page 4, lines 10-19 and Table 1 at pages 20 and 21 of the application.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-8 and 15 over Duhamé, Applicants’ representative argued that the movement detector of Duhamé does not process images to detect movement and that the images taken by Duhamé are not processed by an event generator.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-8 and 15 over Spinelli, Applicants’ representative argued that the alleged event generator of Spinelli does not distinguish between normal operation and exceptional situations. The Examiner argued that the pending claims did not preclude a system that continuously records so long as the indicated event is recorded. The Examiner suggested amending the claims further to specify that recording only occurs after identification of an event.

The claims have been amended in the manner discussed during the interview, and are believed to place the application into condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph**

Claims 1-8 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language is not clearly understood.

Applicants submit that the specification adequately defines “normal operation” and “exceptional situations.” In addition, independent claims 1 and 15 have been further amended to specify “said exceptional situations being defined by said predetermined criteria.”

As noted above, the present application discloses at page 4, lines 10-19 that “[s]ince the sensor arrangement [...] records events, there is provided a possibility of handling dangerous or exceptional situations. Further, the sensor arrangement may merely record certain events, whereby information of normal, uninteresting situations may be discarded . . . . Thus, there is no need of constantly watching the operation of the automatic opening and closing of the door.”

From these passages it follows that most of the time there is no need of watching or recording the automatic opening and closing of the doors since this is an uninteresting, or “normal” situation. For example, with reference to claim 1, automatic opening of the doors is related to a detection of movement by the movement detector. Thus, in particular, automatic opening of the doors due to a detection of movement by the movement detector is to be considered as a “normal” operation of the sensor arrangement.

Further, it follows that certain events are related to “exceptional situations” and therefore are important to record. Examples of such events are given in Table 1, as noted above. Common for these events is that they relate to occurrences that change the conditions of the sensor arrangements as defined by the door device and the field of view. See page 10, lines 23-25.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Duhamel. Further, claims 1-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spinelli. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a sensor arrangement for controlling opening and closing of a door device, the sensor arrangement being arranged to be mounted in a vicinity of the door device, the sensor arrangement including “an image-acquiring means, which is arranged to be mounted in a viewing position wherein said image-acquiring means monitors a field of view that encompasses at least an approach area located adjacent said door device, said image-acquiring means being adapted to acquire images of said field of view,” “a movement detector, which is arranged to receive said acquired images and which is arranged to process the received images in order to detect a movement, which is to result in an opening of

the door device,” and “an event generator, which is arranged to receive information regarding said door device and said field of view, said information comprising said acquired images, said event generator being arranged to process said information in order to identify at least one event according to predetermined criteria, said at least one event pertaining to exceptional situations excluded from normal operation of said sensor arrangement, said exceptional situations being defined by said predetermined criteria, wherein the event generator only creates a recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, and wherein the event generator creates no recording during normal operation of said sensor arrangement.” Independent claim 15 has been similarly amended. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at page 3, lines 30 and 31, page 4, lines 10-15 and lines 17-10, page 25, lines 15-22.

Applicants respectfully submit that these combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 15 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Duhamel and Spinelli, as discussed more fully during the Examiner Interview discussed above.

In particular regarding Duhamel, Duhamel uses an IR-detector to detect the presence of a person in front of a door. See col. 1, ll. 57-60. Upon detection, two things may take place. First, a camera may be activated and a video recorder may record the activities at the door. See col. 3, ll. 27-33. Second, an interrogation signal may be sent into an approach zone in front of the door. The interrogation signal may be received by a transceiver carried by a person, and the transceiver may transmit back an identification code. If the identification code is valid the door may be activated. See col. 1, ll. 60-67.

Based on the foregoing, it is clear that the movement detector (IR-detector) of Duhamel does not process images to detect a movement.

Second, the images acquired in Duhamel are never processed by an event generator. In particular, Duhamel does not disclose an event generator which processes images in order to identify an event.

And third, the recording in Duhamel takes place as soon as a motion is detected and is hence not related to processing of the acquired images in order to identify at least one event. In particular, Duhamel does not disclose an event generator which only in response to an identification of an event pertaining to an exceptional situation creates a recording of the event.

Thus, Duhamel fails to disclose the claimed movement detector and the claimed event generator.

Turning to Spinelli, motion in an approach area in front of a door is detected by processing images from a video device. In case a person is determined to have entered the approach area, a door-opening signal is generated which triggers opening of the door. See abstract. Further, video data may be recorded and stored on a continuous basis or when motion is detected. See col. 8, ll. 17-20. Because the recording in Spinelli takes place on a continuous basis or as soon as a motion is detected, the recording is not related to identification of at least one event pertaining to an exceptional situation. In particular, Spinelli does not disclose an event generator that only creates a recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, and wherein the event generator creates no recording during normal operation of said sensor arrangement.

In contrast, independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to require that the recording of the events takes place only in response to an identification of an event pertaining to an exceptional situation. Further, the claims have been amended to require that the event generator creates no recordings during normal operation of the sensor arrangement. Thus, recording on a continuous basis as taught by Spinelli fails to anticipate the independent claims. Moreover, as further discussed above, detection of movement detection which is to result in an opening of the door device is to be considered as normal operation of the sensor arrangement, and hence the recordings of Spinelli triggered by detection of motion by a movement detector do not anticipate the independent claims.

Thus Spinelli fails to disclose the claimed event generator.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the independent claims 1 and 15 are respectfully requested. With regard to dependent claims 2-8, Applicants submit that claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-8 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1, as well as for their additionally recited subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are also respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50,875 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: September 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000

CDW

Attachments: Replacement Sheets Figs. 5-12